

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-1550**

---

CHARLES W. ANDERSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE; J & E ASSOCIATES,  
INCORPORATED; BERNARD BERGER; REBECCA BARNES;  
CHARLES E. SMITH MANAGEMENT, INCORPORATED;  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

WILLIAM C. DALEY, Secretary for United States  
Department of Commerce; TODD DICKERSON, Com-  
missioner, United States Patent Office; NICH-  
OLAS GODICI, Deputy Commissioner of United  
States Patent Office; WILLIAM JENKINS; THOMAS  
MAGNETTI, Esquire, United States Department of  
Commerce; LAURA GUILLESPIE, Esquire, United  
States Department of Commerce; CATHERINE  
KESSMEIR, Esquire, United States Patent Of-  
fice; SYDNEY ROSE, Personnel, United States  
Patent Office; LAVON PROCTOR, Human Resources,  
United States PTO; CALIB J.R. GARLAND, Secu-  
rity, United States PTO; JOHN J. LOVE, Direc-  
tor Group, United States PTO; WYNN COGGINS,  
United States Patent Office; JENNIFER SADULA,  
United States Patent Office; RONALD STRIGHT,  
United States Patent Office; SHARON FINKEL,  
United States Patent Office; WILLIAM NOGGLE,  
United States PTO; KELLY O'HARA, United States  
Patent Office; CHERYL HUSEMAN, United States  
PTO; CAREY O'CONNOR, United States PTO; CHRIS  
RODRIGUEZ, United States PTO; CORRINE MCDER-

MOTT, United States PTO; KIMBERLY ASHER,  
United States PTO,

Defendants.

---

**No. 00-1868**

---

CHARLES W. ANDERSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE; J & E ASSOCIATES,  
INCORPORATED; BERNARD BERGER; REBECCA BARNES;  
CHARLES E. SMITH MANAGEMENT, INCORPORATED;  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

WILLIAM C. DALEY, Secretary for United States  
Department of Commerce; TODD DICKERSON, Com-  
missioner, United States Patent Office; NICH-  
OLAS GODICI, Deputy Commissioner of United  
States Patent Office; WILLIAM JENKINS; THOMAS  
MAGNETTI, Esquire, United States Department of  
Commerce; LAURA GUILLESPIE, Esquire, United  
States Department of Commerce; CATHERINE  
KESSMEIR, Esquire, United States Patent Of-  
fice; SYDNEY ROSE, Personnel, United States  
Patent Office; LAVON PROCTOR, Human Resources,  
United States PTO; CALIB J.R. GARLAND, Secu-  
rity, United States PTO; JOHN J. LOVE, Direc-  
tor Group, United States PTO; WYNN COGGINS,  
United States Patent Office; JENNIFER SADULA,  
United States Patent Office; RONALD STRIGHT,  
United States Patent Office; SHARON FINKEL,  
United States Patent Office; WILLIAM NOGGLE,  
United States PTO; KELLY O'HARA, United States

Patent Office; CHERYL HUSEMAN, United States  
PTO; CAREY O'CONNOR, United States PTO; CHRIS  
RODRIGUEZ, United States PTO; CORRINE MCDER-  
MOTT, United States PTO; KIMBERLY ASHER,  
United States PTO,

Defendants.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District  
Judge. (CA-00-109-A)

---

Submitted: November 30, 2000                      Decided: December 28, 2000

---

Before LUTTIG, WILLIAMS, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Charles W. Anderson, Appellant Pro Se. Joel Eric Wilson, Special  
Assistant United States Attorney, Edward John Martin, OFFICE OF THE  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia; Jeffrey William  
Pagano, KING, PAGANO & HARRISON, New York, New York; Steven R.  
Schaars, KING, PAGANO & HARRISON, Washington, D.C.; Ralph Nicholas  
Boccarosse, Jr., SICILIANO, ELLIS, DYER & BOCCAROSSE, Fairfax,  
Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Charles W. Anderson appeals the district court's orders granting Defendants' motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Anderson v. Daley, No. CA-00-109-A (E.D. Va. Apr. 12, 2000; Apr. 26, 2000; May 24, 2000; June 13, 2000; June 27, 2000).<sup>\*</sup> We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

<sup>\*</sup> Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the judgment or order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's orders. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).